REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 28, 2008, having a shortened statutory period set to expire August 28, 2008. Proposed amendments to the Claims include cancelling Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12, 14-17, 19-20 and 22, and adding Claims 23-31. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, Claims 23-31 will now be pending.

Applicants' undersigned representative greatly appreciates the time and courtesy extended by the Examiner during an August 6, 2008 teleconference. The undersigned has attempted to make all Examiner-suggested changes to the proposed new amendments. If the undersigned has failed to do so, or if the Examiner believes that addition discussion would be useful in promoting the present claims to allowance, a telephone call to the undersigned at 512.306.0796 would be greatly appreciated.

PRIOR REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Although all previously pending claims that were rejected in the present Office Action have been cancelled, Applicants believe that none of the cited art found in the prosecution history of the present application teach or suggest the claimed features as now claimed. That is, while some or all of the cited art, including *Schwabe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,883,163 – "*Schwabe '163*"), *Stammers et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,554 – "*Stammers*"), *Ji* (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,641 – "*Ji*"), *Levy et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,147 – "*Levy*"), *Schwabe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,981,245 – "*Schwabe '245*") and *Schwabe, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,155 – "*Schwabe '155*"), teach the use of JAVA CAP card files (i.e., "a reduced set of code") that have been created from a full JAVA file set, none of the cited art teaches or suggests a method of ensuring that the JAVA CAP card files adhere to the JAVA syntax (i.e., "a pre-defined language syntax").

With regards to exemplary **Claim 23**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest:

"A computer-implemented method of ensuring that a reduced set of code" (as supported in the original specification on page 1, lines 17-20) "adheres to a pre-defined

language syntax" (supported on page 4, lines 25-26), the computer-implemented method comprising:

"determining if an original full-version code file complies with a pre-defined language syntax" (supported on page 11, lines 10-11), "wherein the original full-version code file is capable of executing all instructions and utilizing all features found in a full version of a programming language" (supported on page 1, lines 13-16);

"in response to determining that the original full-version code file complies with the pre-defined language syntax, creating a first cryptographic signature for the original full-version code file" (supported on page 11, lines 11-12);

"storing the first cryptographic signature on a smart card" (supported on page 11, lines 19-20), "wherein the smart card comprises a limited-capacity embedded microcontroller" (supported on page 2, lines 7-9);

"converting the original full-version code file into a reduced-version code file" (supported on page 11, lines 22-23), "wherein the reduced-version code file is capable of executing only a limited subset of instructions and features found in the full version of the programming language" (supported on page 2, lines 9-12);

"converting the reduced-version code file into a converted file" (supported on page 11, line 28), "wherein the converted file is capable of utilizing all features found in the full version of the programming language" (supported on page 1, lines 13-16), "and wherein converting the reduced-version code file into the converted file is performed by a pre-conversion step, a mapping step, and a final conversion step,

wherein the pre-conversion step includes:

converting the reduced-version code file into a preconverted file, wherein the preconverted file utilizes the pre-defined language syntax, and wherein the preconverted file includes a preconverted code section and a preconverted code description section, and wherein the mapping step includes:

utilizing a mapper to replace, in the preconverted file, externally defined names in the reduced-version code file with original names that are used in the full-version code file, wherein the mapper utilizes an export file that was created during the pre-conversion step, and wherein

external references found in the preconverted file are resolved and
converted into symbolic external reference for every class file that is
referenced by the reduced-version code file, and

wherein the final conversion step includes:

converting the preconverted file into the converted file by
rearranging individual code sections, header sections and link information
so that they comply with the pre-defined language syntax, wherein the
converted file includes a converted class description and converted
executable instructions that are respectively derived from the preconverted
code section and the preconverted code description section in the
preconverted file" (supported on page 14, line 1 to page 15, line 7);

" in response to determining that the converted file complies with the pre-defined
language syntax, creating a second cryptographic signature for the converted file"
(supported on page 13, lines 10-11);

"storing the second cryptographic signature on the smart card" (supported on page
13, line 17); and

"in response to the first cryptographic signature matching the second
cryptographic signature, storing the reduced-version code file on the smart card
(supported on page 13, lines 20-22), "wherein the first cryptographic signature and the
second cryptographic signature match only if the original full-version code file, the
reduced-version code file and the converted file comply with the pre-defined language
syntax" (supported on page 13 ,lines 1-2 and 7-25).

With regards to exemplary new **Claim 24**, a combination of previously cited art
does not teach or suggest "wherein the converted file contains a different class file than
the original full-version code file, but wherein the converted file and the original full-
version code file are semantically identical according to syntax rules set by the pre-
defined language syntax" (supported in the original specification on page 11, lines 29-
30).

With regards to new **Claim 25**, a combination of previously cited art does not teach or suggest "wherein creating and comparing the first cryptographic signature and the second cryptographic signature are performed outside the smart card" (supported in the original specification on page 12, lines 23-25).

Similar features are claimed in corresponding **Claims 26-28**, which are for a tangible computer-readable medium on which is stored instructions for performing the claimed method (as supported in the original specification on page 20, lines 13-15).

Similar features are claimed in corresponding **Claims 29-31**, which are for a computer system that comprises tangible computer-readable medium on which is stored instructions for performing the claimed method (as supported in the original specification on page 20, lines 10-12).

CONCLUSION

As a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest all limitations found in the presently pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. As stated above, if the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be useful in promoting any or all of the present claims to allowance, such a telephone call to the Applicant's undersigned representative, at 512.306.0796, would be greatly appreciated.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0461**.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
LAW OFFICE OF JIM BOICE
3839 Bee Cave Road
Suite 201
West Lake Hills, Texas 78746
512.306.1200

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)